







UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|---|---------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|
| 09/072,549 | 05/05/1998 | LESTER F. LUDWIG | COLB001/22US | 6658 | |
| 75 | 90 03/21/2002 | | | | |
| SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS, PLLC 1010 El Camino Real Suite 360 | | | EXAMINER | | |
| | | | DINH, DUNG C | | |
| Menlo Park, CA | 94025 | | | | |
| monto rank, or | 1 7.025 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | 2153 | 33 | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 03/21/2002 | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Q

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | <i>y</i> • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| Advisory Action | 09/072,549 | LUDWIG ET AL. | | | | |
| , at least y least. | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | Dung Dinh | 2153 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the o | orrespondence add | ress | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 11 March 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | | | | | | |
| | PLY [check either a) or b)] | | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expires 5 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverse, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three more earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THI te on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.3 sion and the corresponding amount of the I statutory period for reply originally set in | f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. S I36(a) and the appropriate exithe fee. The appropriate exithe final Office action; or | See MPEP e extension fee tension fee under (2) as set forth in | | | |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on 11 March 2002. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. | | | | | | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b | | | | | | |
| (a) they raise new issues that would require furth | er consideration and/or search (| see NOTE below); | | | | |
| (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below); | | | | | | |
| (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or | | | | | | |
| (d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: | | | | | | |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | | | | | |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | be allowable if submitted in a s | separate, timely file | d amendment | | | |
| 5.⊠ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)⊠ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>see attachment</u> . | | | | | | |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. | cause it is not directed SOLELY | to issues which we | ere newly | | | |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w | | | and an | | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: 1-5, 7-15, 17-25, 27-31. | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | | | |
| 8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is | a) approved or b) disap | proved by the Exan | niner. | | | |
| Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s) | | | | | | |
| 10. Other: | | | | | | |
| | | Dung Dinh Primary Examiner Art Unit: 2153 | | | | |

Application/Control Number: 09/072,549

Art Unit: 2153

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 3/11/02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant presented lengthy technical argument concerning why the prior art is not enabled for TV quality transision over UTP. It is noted that none of these technical details were disclosed in the specification. This further support the examiner position that the specification lacks proper enablement. It also noted that the "TV quality" as recited in the claim does not provide for any specific limitation as to what kind of video signal would constitute TV quality (e.g. the parameters or bandwidth of the video signal). Therefore, the argument that the prior art is not enabled for transmitting TV quality over UTP is not persuasive.

As per the applicant arguement concerning the specification providing adequate disclosure. The argument is not persuasive because the sections cited by applicant merely disclose very high level, generic information applicable for transmitting a video signal. However, the information disclosed does not provide for any specific so as to enable transmitting "TV quality" video over UTP.

Application/Control Number: 09/072,549

Art Unit: 2153

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dung Dinh whose telephone number is (703) 305-9655. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:00 AM - 4:30 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached at (703) 305-4792.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group 2100 Customer Service whose telephone number is (703) 306-5631.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks Washington, DC 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 746-7239, (for formal communications intended for entry)

(703) 746-7240 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA, Fourth Floor (Receptionist).

Dung Dinh

Primary Examiner March 20, 2002